

Appl. No. : 09/251,218
Filed : February 16, 1999

NEW CLAIMS

The system of new Claim 67 comprises a three-dimensional representation of a first and second product stored in a storage media, and a product display module. The product display module is configured to allow a user to modify a presentation of the first product and the second product, save the modified product presentations, and view both the first and second modified product presentations simultaneously. More specifically, as described in Applicant's specification with reference to a specific embodiment (page 33, line 2 through page 34, line 10), the system of Claim 67 allows a user to create a plurality of customized product presentations, to store the customized product presentations for later viewing, and to view a plurality of stored customized product presentations simultaneously for side-by-side comparison. In one embodiment, several different products can be displayed in a "Virtual Showroom", as illustrated in Figures 12-14. The elements of Claims 67-68 are not taught or suggested by the prior art, therefore Claims 67-68 are respectfully submitted for review as patentable subject matter.

In the system of new Claim 69, the product display module is configured to allow a user to superimpose a first and second product presentation or physical product exterior/interior options. Specific embodiments of the system of Claim 69 are described in more detail in Applicant's specification at page 36, lines 1-7, wherein the system allows a user to compare sizes and shapes of vehicles, portions of vehicles (trunk, engine), and specific vehicle options (roof racks) by superimposing presentations of vehicles or portions of a vehicle.

Applicant's original Claim 24 contains a limitation directed to a superimposing, similar to Claim 69, and was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Kenney and the Examiner's assertion that object superimposing is old and well known in graphic art. Applicant, however, disagrees. The applicant first respectfully requests that the Examiner provide a reference in support of the assertion that superimposing is old and well known. Even if certain methods of superimposing have been practiced, the nature and context of these methods is relevant to any purported finding of obviousness. With the presently outstanding rejection, even if it were true that superimposing in some general sense is old, the Examiner has not demonstrated that one of ordinary skill in the art would find a suggestion to make the proposed

Appl. No. : 09/251,218
Filed : February 16, 1999

combination of graphic arts techniques (none of which are specifically cited) and Kenney. Thus, Claim 69 is respectfully submitted for review as patentable subject matter.

CONCLUSION

The applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. In light of these remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 5-31-02

By: 

Thomas R. Arno
Registration No. 40,490
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 235-8550

S:\DOCS\TCM\TCM-1486.DOC
052902